

Amendments to the Drawings:

Replacement sheets for FIGS. 1-5 are enclosed which formalize the drawings that were submitted with the application. No other changes have been made. Approval by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

REMARKS

Formal drawings are submitted herewith approval by the Examiner of these drawings is respectfully requested.

Applicant confirms the provisional election with traverse of claims 1, 2 and 4. Claim 3 has been withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention.

By this amendment claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner to remove an ambiguity. Further the claim has been changed to clarify the invention and to provide Applicants with the scope of protection to which they are entitled. The anodes can be formed over either surface of the substrate (see page 26, line 28-page 27, line 4). Step (c) has been amended to clearly recite that one or more unpatterned light emitting layers can be formed from one or more coated donor elements (see page 21, lines 24-26 and page 25, lines 2-6.)

An important feature of the present invention set forth in claim 1 is that “the use of a donor element without the need of exact positioning requirements required for donor element transfer...increasing and reducing cycle time and cost of manufacturing.” (see page 3, lines 16-19).

Claim 4 has been amended to more clearly set forth the invention.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolk (US 6,194,119) in view of Gaudiana et al. (US 6,624,839).

The Examiner is correct in describing Wolk as teaching imagewise transfer of a layer to form a pattern (see col. 7, lines 18-35). Wolk never appreciates that an unpatterned layer(s) could be used to produce white light. Typically donor elements have been used in making patterned OLED layers. Clearly there is no motivation in Wolk for the subject matter of claim 1. Further, claim 1 provides manufacturing advantages not suggested by Wolk.

Gaudiana et al discloses forming a light emitting OLED with a color filter. They do not disclose or suggest the use of donor elements in forming OLED devices. Claim 1 as now amended recites that the color filter array can be formed on one side of the substrate and the anodes formed on either side of the substrate. Claim 2 sets forth that the donor element can have a series of coated

patches of transferable emissive material which are sequentially moved to the transfer position. Each one of these coated patches is used in the process of forming an unpatterned light emitting layer.

With respect to claim 2 Wolk discloses pattern transfer from a donor to a receptor. This is not the same as claim 2 wherein coated patches are formed on the donor element. Applicants fail to see the relevance of Wolk with respect to claim 2.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that claim 1 defines unobvious subject matter. Claim 2 should also be allowed along with claim 1.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolk (US 6,194,119) in view of Kunimoto et al (6,258,954).

Claim 4 is directed to a method of manufacturing an OLED device which emits white light. As amended it requires an inspection step prior to transfer of unpatterned layer(s) which will produce white light. Amended claim 4 moves the coated donor support into a transfer position with the OLED device and forming an unpatterned light-emitting layer(s). The same arguments applied to claim 1 with respect to Wolk and Gaudiana et al apply now to amended claim 4 since neither of these references form unpatterned layer(s) from a coated donor support.

Kunimoto et al disclose that their disclosed coating materials can be coated on a substrate using customary techniques. They do not disclose using a donor support. Moreover, their inspection is of a formed coating and not inspection of a donor support prior to coating. Applicants fail to see how Kunimoto et al is relevant to claim 4 or how it can reasonably be combined with Wolk.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Raymond L. Owens
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 22,363

RLO/das
Telephone 585-477-4653
Facsimile 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.